

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ANIECE JEMAL,

Defendant and Appellant.

D054666

(Super. Ct. No. SCD208093)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Francisco  
P. Marty, Jr., Commissioner. Affirmed.

Aniece Jemal entered a negotiated guilty plea to possession of methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a)). The court suspended imposition of sentence and placed Jemal on three years' formal probation pursuant to Proposition 36 (Pen. Code, § 1210 et seq.) On two different occasions, Jemal failed to report to orientation for his drug program and his probation was summarily revoked.

Subsequently, Jemal's parole in another case was revoked and he was sent to prison. After his release from prison, Jemal admitted violating the terms of his Penal Code section 1210 probation by failing to report to his drug program for orientation and by suffering a new arrest. The trial court sentenced Jemal to the mid-term of two years for possession of methamphetamine.

### FACTS

On August 1, 2007, Jemal, who was on parole, was contacted by police, who found .16 grams of methamphetamine in his shoe.

### DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings below. Counsel presents no argument for reversal, but asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to as possible but not arguable issues: (1) whether the trial court should have sentenced Jemal to a term concurrent with the time he served on the parole violation; and (2) whether Jemal should have received credits for the time he spent in custody on the parole violation.

We granted Jemal permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded.

A review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, including the possible issues referred to by appellate counsel, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issues. Jemal has been adequately represented by counsel on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

Judgment affirmed.

---

IRION, J.

WE CONCUR:

---

McDONALD, Acting P. J.

---

O'ROURKE, J.